

Rejection of claims 1-7, 17-22 and 33-39 under §103(a) over Romans

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner maintains that Romans discloses the following features of claim 1:

an awake window interval counting unit which counts, in a counting, the interval value in the awake window set by the awake window setting unit; and

an inactive state conversion unit which, if the awake window counting unit finishes the counting, converts the awake window into an inactive state.

Applicant disagrees.

Romans discloses that:

**[t]o receive broadcast messages a PS station should notify the Control Point that it is going to be using power management (see section on Requesting Power Management Support from a Control Point) and then remain awake until it receives a Control Point Beacon containing the broadcast countdown counter. From the countdown counter the station can then determine the start of the broadcast period and go into sleep mode until immediately before the start of the broadcast period when it will wake-up to receive the CPB at the start of the broadcast period.**

In other words, Romans discloses **counting during the sleep period**. In contrast, claim 1 recites an awake window interval counting unit **which counts**, in a counting, **the interval value in the awake window** set by the awake window setting unit, in combination with other elements of the claim.

Because Romans fails to disclose the unit which counts, in a counting, the interval value in the awake window, Romans cannot possibly disclose an inactive state conversion unit which,

if the awake window counting unit finishes the counting, converts the awake window into an inactive state.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that an inactive state conversion unit which, if the awake window counting unit finishes the counting, converts the awake window into an inactive state, is a conditional aspect of the invention that must be considered by the Examiner. Applicant points out that Romans makes absolutely no mention of what would occur if the awake window counting unit finishes the counting.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, claims 17 and 33 are patentable and claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, claim 18-23, which depend from claim 17, and claims 24-39, which depend from claim 33, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

S. Stuart Lee  
Registration No. 61,124

Date: October 5, 2007